



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,427	02/06/2006	Rudolf Rigler	2923-747	8429
6449	7590	09/05/2008		
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER	
			ELEY, JESSICA L	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2884		
		NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		09/05/2008		ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/567,427	Applicant(s) RIGLER ET AL.
	Examiner JESSICA L. ELEY	Art Unit 2884

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 7-10 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 7-10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/06/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06 February 2006</u>	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 1-6 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Group I, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 30 April 2008.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 6 February 2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because reference characters **2** and **10** are missing from FIG. 1. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing

sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 7 is a device for carrying out the method of claim 1 which has been withdrawn. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoyt US 2001/0033374 A1 and further in view of Stern et al. US 2005/0012033 A1 (henceforth referred to as Stern).

Regarding **claim 7**, Hoyt teaches a device for determining luminescent molecules by means of optical excitation in confocal measuring volumes (FIG. 6), comprising:

A carrier arrangement (plate 33) for holding a sample that contains molecules (illuminate sample 50) to be determined,

An optical excitation device for providing multiple light beams and, in particular, comprising

at least one light source **30**,

at least one passive or active diffractive optical element **40** for splitting penetrating light into multiple beam, and

a focusing optics **36** for focusing penetrating multiple light beams into multiple confocal volume elements in the respective measuring volume for the purpose of exciting luminescence in the multiple confocal volume elements,

An optical detection device **55** for detecting luminescence for the confocal volume elements, for capturing emitted radiation from the multiple confocal volume elements, and

Signal processing and evaluation means for processing the signals provided by the detector (FIG. 7).

Hoyt does not go into detail about the detector element **55**, instead leaving it to one of ordinary skill in the art to pursue the known options in the art. Stern teaches an imager for use in the field of bio-fluorescence (¶0014). The detector taught by Stern comprises a spatially resolving sensor matrix of avalanche photodiodes that is produced using IC technology, in particular CMOS technology, and is integrated in a sensor chip with Geiger mode wiring (¶0117). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the imager taught by Stern in the system taught by Hoyt since Stern teaches that this imager outperforms with respect to low-light sensitivity and high speed applications requiring real-time continuous data acquisition and signal processing (¶0117).

Regarding **claim 8**, the disclosures of Hoyt and Stern address all the limitations of parent claim 7, further the teachings of Stern show the signal processing and evaluation means are integrated in the sensor chip (¶0083).

Regarding **claim 9**, the disclosures of Hoyt and Stern address all the limitations of parent claim 7, further the teachings of Stern teach the detector in which the signal processing and evaluation means comprises at least one cross-correlation function of first or higher correlation orders of measuring signals (¶0040).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoyt US 2001/0033374 A1 and Stern et al. US 2005/0012033 A1 (henceforth referred to as Stern), and further in view of Silver US 6,078,681.

Regarding claim 10, the disclosures of Hoyt and Stern address all the limitations of parent claim 7, as discussed above. Hoyt and Stern do not directly teach the signal processing and evaluation means comprising circuits for carrying out a fast Fourier transform of the measuring signals. However, such a step is very common in the art as evidenced by Silver. Silver teaches an imaging system that uses fast Fourier transform as an analysis tool (column 12 lines 50-54). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a fast Fourier transform of the measuring signal since Silver teaches that standard software exists for analysis of multichannel image data (column 12 lines 49-56), which the image data from Hoyt and Stern is.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JESSICA L. ELEY whose telephone number is (571)272-9793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00-6:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Porta can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. L. E./
Examiner, Art Unit 2884
/David P. Porta/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2884